21001

FEB 03 2004

OFFICIAL

Litthe United States Patent and Trademark Office

Serial No.: 09/526,783

§

Filing Date: 03/16/2000

Title: INVALIDATING DEVICE FOR

Examiner: DEXTER, CLARK F

PERFORATING PLANE

Applicant: SAUER et al.

GA No.: 3724

Atty docket no: 1.G164.186

6 pages

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR §1.8. I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile

tebruary

Tipped or printed name of person signing this certificate : C. DELLEY

Signature of person signing this certificate:

SECOND REQUEST FOR REFUND FOR ERRONEOUS PETITION FOR REQUEST TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT

To fax: 001 703 872 9303

Attn. Mr. Clark F. Dexter

United States Patent and Trademark Office Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

Dear Sir:

On June 30, 2003 we received a Notice of Abandonment dated June 18, 2003 for failure to timely respond to the Office Action mailed on September 24, 2002. A copy of this Notice is herewith enclosed. In response, Applicant submitted this Request for Withdrawal of the Holding of Abandonment which was denied, a copy of the decision being attached.

Applicant noticed that due to error without deceptive intent, namely, failing to link the abandoned case to the continuation case (Ser. No. 10/350,507, filed on 01/24/2003) filed in its stead, that this petition to revive was filed. In fact, it was indeed the intention of the Applicant to abandon this application, in favor of the aforementioned continuation application.

Applicant therefore requests that the Petition for an Unintentionally Abandoned Application be considered null and void at its inception and so be withdrawn. It is believed that a refund of the petition fee of \$1300 for an unintentionally abandoned application is in order, although it is understood that the Commissioner may be justified in deducting from the amount to be refunded a petition fee of \$130 and whatever actual costs that the Commissioner may have incurred in responding to the erroneous petition.

The Undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to debit the account of BUGNION SA, no 50 0800 for any fees that may be due under this Petition.

If the Commissionter has further questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at phone 011-4122-747-78-49 or fax at 011-4122-346-89-60 or e-mail at patents@bugnion.ch.

Respectfully submitted,

John MOETTELI U.S. Reg. No. 35,289

Date: February 2, 2004

Enclosures: Copy of Decision on Petition to withdraw Abandoment

Copy of Notice of Abandonment

Copy of Decision on First Refund Request (letter of Dec 15, 2003)



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

www.uspto.gov

BUGNION SA

09.01.2004 08 45

December 15, 2003

Bien:reçu merci received with thanks

16HN MOETTELLI **BUGNION S A** CASE 375 GENEVA, ZZ CH-1211 GENEVA 12 RECEIVED
FEB 0 5 2004
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

Dear-Sir/Madam. □

Tল্লাs is to Deny your refund request in the amount of \$1,300.00, for patent/serial number 09526783.

Application or petition fee not refundable. Money paid by actual mistake or in excess, such as payment not required by law, will be refunded; but a mere change of purpose after payment of money, as when a party desires to withdraw an application, an appeal or a request for oral hearing does not entitle the party to a refund (37 CFR 1.26). If any application is filed without the specification or drawing and the ommission is corrected with in the period set, the application will be returned or otherwise disposed of. The fee, if submitted should include the \$130.00 handling fee (37 CFR 1.53).

Sincerely,

KAREN CREASY

Office of Petition

Refund Section, Office of Finance



30.06.2003 09 14

United States Patent and Trademark Office

received with thanks

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Fatent and Trademork Office Ablors: COMMISSIONER FOR FATENTS FO. Soz. 1450 Alexandra, Vighia 22313-1450 everapings

APPLIĞATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09\$26,783	03/16/2000	Karl Hartmut Sauer	1.G164.186	1623	
e H	590 06/18/2003				
Jahn Moettelli			EXAMINER		
Bagnion S A Case 375			DEXTER,	DEXTER, CLARK F	
Geneva, CH- SWITZERLA	1211 GENEVA 12 ND		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
i.	-	•	3724		
4			DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003		
<u>}-</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	18,2003	

Please sind below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. 09/526,783	Applicant(s)	Sauer et	al.				
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner		Art Unit					
i	· ·	ter	3724					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears This application is abandoned in view of:	on the cover sheet wi	th the oorres	pondence addre	- TECEII.				
1. Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the	e Office letter mailed	on <i>Sep 24</i>	1, 2002Q	FICE OF 2004				
1. Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the	ith a Certificate of Ma	ailing or Trai	nsmission date	d Ur PETITION				
), which is after the expiration	on of the period for re	epiy (includi	ing a total exte	naion or time or of the				
(b) A proposed reply was received on	, but it does n	ot constitut	e a proper repl	y under 37 CFR				
1.113(a) to the final rejection.								
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final reject the application in condition for allowance; (2) a time Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complia	ely filed Notice of App ance with 37 CFR 1.1	ceal (with a) 114).	ppeal fee); or (3) a timely filed				
(c) A reply was received onburproper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 C	t it does not constitut FR 1.85(a) and 1.11	te a proper i 1. (See exp	reply, or a bon- planation in box	a fide attempt at a (7 below).				
(d) 🗵 No reply has been received.								
2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue of three months from the mailing date of the Notice	fee and publication for e of Allowance (PTOL	e, if applica -85).	able, within the	statutory period				
(a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, to Transmission dated), which is a issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of	after the expiration of of Allowance (PTOL-8	r the statuto 85).	ory period for p	icate of Mailing or ayment of the				
(b) The submitted issue fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance of \$ is due.								
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d) is \$ (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.								
				•				
3. Applicate to timely file corrected drawings Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).				•				
(a) Propesed new formal drawings were received o Transmission dated), whic	n h is after the expiration	_ (with a Ce on of the pe	ertificate of Ma Priod for reply.	iling or				
(b) No carrected drawings have been received.		•						
4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed interest; or all of the applicants.	d by the attorney or ε	igent of rec	ord, the assign	ee of the entire				
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continu	d by an attorney or a ing application.	gent (acting	in a represent	ative capacity				
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and I period for seeking court review of the decision has	Interferences rendered s expired and there as	d on re no allowe		and because the				
7. ☐ The reason(s) below:			(OUTH				
ι. 			C PR	CLARK F. DEXTER HMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3724				
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or reques should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects	sts to withdraw the h on patent term.	olding of at	oandonment un					

: DECISION ON PETITION



United States Patent and Trademark Office

Sept. 23, 2003 JUL 23 2003 COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450 WWW.19505.000

Paper No. 17

In re Application of

Karl Hartmut Sauer et al

Application No. 09/526,783

Filed: March 16, 2000

Attorney Docket No. 1.G164.186

This is a decision on the petition filed by facsimile transmission on July 8, 2003 by which petitioners request withdrawal of the holding that this application stands abandoned for failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on September 24, 2002. The petition is considered under 37 CFR 1.181 and no fee is required.

The petstion is <u>denied</u>.

Petitioners allege that a timely reply to the Office letter in question was in fact filed. Petitioners support this allegation by including a copy of the reply. The reply has 37 CFR 1.8(a) certificate of mailing affixed thereto that is dated December 18, 2002.

However, the record shows that the Office letter in question was a final rejection. The record further shows that on December 30, 2002, an advisory action was mailed to petitioners. The advisory action states that the amendment in question would not be entered, and gives reasons for the sefusal to enter the amendment.

It therefore appears that this application became abandoned for failure to file a proper reply to the final rejection. It does not appear from the record that the abandonment was the fault of the Office; father, it appears that petitioners did not take steps to insure that a proper reply to the final rejection, within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.113 and 37 CFR 1.116 was filed. In general, see MPEP \$\frac{1}{2}\$ 714.12 and 714.13. See also MPEP 711.03(c) which states that "[E]vidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment." It appears, therefore, that petitioners' proper course of action is to proceed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137.

Petitioners may file a request for reconsideration of this decision, provided that such request is filed within two months of the date of this decision. The application is being returned to storage as an abandoned file.

PETITION DENIED.

E. Rollins-Cross, Director, Patent Examining Groups 3710 and 3720

John Mpettelli Bugnioù S.A.

Case 375

VIA AIR MAIL

Geneval CH-1211 GENEVA 12

SWITZERLAND